



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/780,313	02/09/2001	Sujoy D. Guha	6130 PA01	6705

27111 7590 09/04/2003

BROWN, MARTIN, HALLER & MCCLAIN LLP  
1660 UNION STREET  
SAN DIEGO, CA 92101-2926

EXAMINER

SONG, HOON K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2882

DATE MAILED: 09/04/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/780,313

Applicant(s)

GUHA ET AL.

Examiner

Hoon Song

Art Unit

2882

12

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 June 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 and 10-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 10-14 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 6 and 7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 2-5 and 8 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 February 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1 and 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roberts et al. (US 5440648) in view of Ho (US 6236429B1)

Regarding claim 1, Roberts teaches a system for web inspection of a web, the system comprising:

a plurality of smart cameras (30), each smart camera for detecting a plurality of web flaws from a streaming video signal, each smart camera having means for generating output data comprising a digitalized data of each flaw of the plurality of web

Art Unit: 2882

flaws and for generating flaw location data for each flaw of the plurality of web flaws (column 4 line 11+);

a host computer (46) for controlling the low contrast web inspection system and for accepting and displaying the flaw image data and the flaw location data; and an Ethernet (52) for connecting the plurality of smart cameras to the host computer.

However Roberts fails to teach that the flaw data is image data.

Ho teaches a flaw image generator (Camera 20, including a canning device and data processing circuitry).

In vie of Ho, it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to output flaw image data in order to visually and manually identity the flaw. Accordingly, one would be motivated to output flaw image because it would provide more efficient operation and more increased resolution (column 2 line 36+).

Regarding claim 6, Roberts teaches that each smart camera of the plurality of smart cameras detects the plurality of web flaws from the streaming video signal at a contrast approaching a signal noise level (column 8 line 19+).

### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

Claims 10-14 are allowed over prior art.

Claims 2 and 8 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Art Unit: 2882

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: None of the prior art teaches that the smart camera comprises a multi-pipeline pre-processor for filtering the corrected pixel representation, the multi-pipeline preprocessor generating a prioritized data stream of potential flaws, a blob detector for generating block data regarding the location of blocks of the potential flaws along a machine direction; and an inspect/reject analyzer for determining actual flaw data from the prioritized data stream of potential flaws as claimed in claim 2.

None of the prior art teaches that the generating flaw data and flaw location data comprises the steps of: generating a prioritized data stream from the plurality of potential flaw data streams; generating cross direction location data regarding a location of the prioritized data stream; generating block data regarding the location of blocks of the prioritized data stream along a machine direction; and determining actual flaw data from the prioritized data stream of potential flaws utilizing the cross direction location data and the block data as claimed in claim 8.

None of the prior art teaches a web inspection system for detecting a flaw of a plurality of possible flaws on a web having a smart camera comprising at least one multi group thresholder for grouping the first and second pixel representations to generate at least two data streams of potential flaws and a priority logic circuit for prioritizing the at least two data streams of potential flaws to generate the digitized video data stream of the flaw as claimed in independent claim 10.

***Response to Argument***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-14 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hoon Song whose telephone number is 703-308-2736. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM - 5 PM, Monday - Friday.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward Glick can be reached on 703-308-4858. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 09/780,313

Page 6

Art Unit: 2882

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.

  
**DAVID V. BRUCE**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

Hoon Song